

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3 and 5-14 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended and claim 4 is canceled. Support for the amended claims may be found in the original specification at, for example, claim 4. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments:

(a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments merely incorporate features of a dependent claim into an independent claim); and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to new art presented for the first time in the final rejection. Entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application are thus respectfully requested.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

**Verhoest**

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,993,082 ("Verhoest"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Verhoest fails to teach or suggest an oiling roller assembly, including at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap further includes a flange portion (e.g., labeled 122 in the Figures of the present application) at an end of the cap that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion (e.g., labeled 124 in the Figures of the present application) at an opposite end of the cap, as recited in independent claim 1.

Verhoest merely discloses that a separate portion 64 (alleged cap) of an outer layer extends over an end face of an inner layer 58. See column 7, lines 62-64. Nowhere does Verhoest teach or suggest that the separate portion (alleged cap) includes a flange portion that

comes into contact with the oiling roller or a recess portion as recited in the present claims.

Verhoest describes that piece 64 is open and does not cover shaft 18, and thus teaches against a recess portion (because the shaft must protrude through the piece 64). As such, Verhoest fails to teach each and every claim feature.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Privin

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,406,885 ("Privin"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Privin fails to teach or suggest an oiling roller assembly, including at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap further includes a flange portion at an end of the cap that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion at an opposite end of the cap, as recited in independent claim 1.

Privin merely discloses that spools 220 and 230 (alleged roller shafts) are mounted on hub portions 240 and 242 (alleged caps). See column 8, lines 33-36. Nowhere does Privin teach or suggest that the hub portions (alleged caps) include a flange portion or a recess portion as recited in the present claims.

Further, the Office Action asserts that Privin discloses a recess portion (retainer 112) at an opposite end of a cap (hub portions 240 and 242). However, the retainer 112 (alleged recess portion) is not in the end of the cap as recited in the present claims, but is actually a disposable ink cartridge. See column 8, lines 54 and 55. As such, Privin fails to teach each and every claim feature.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Schaefer

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,565,743 ("Schaefer"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Schaefer fails to teach or suggest an oiling roller assembly, including at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap further includes a flange portion at an end of the cap that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion at an opposite end of the cap, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that FIGs. 1-4 of Schaefer clearly show end caps on a shaft. However, Schaefer merely discloses that a roller includes a closed end 23 (alleged cap). See column 3, lines 2 and 3. Nowhere does Schaefer teach or suggest that at an end cap further includes a flange portion or a recess portion as recited in the present claims. As such, Schaefer fails to teach or suggest each and every claim feature.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Liebelt

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 2,563,049 ("Liebelt"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Liebelt fails to teach or suggest an oiling roller assembly, including at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap further includes a flange portion at an end of the cap that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion at an opposite end of the cap, as recited in independent claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that FIGs. 1-11 of Liebelt clearly show end caps on a shaft. Liebelt merely discloses a bushing 17 (alleged cap) that includes an interior annular flange 18 and an exterior flange 19. See column 3, lines 5-8. However, assuming that bushing 17 is a cap and annular flange 18 is a flange portion at an end of the cap, nowhere does Liebelt teach

or suggest that a cap further includes a flange portion at an end of the cap that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion at an opposite end of the cap as recited in the present claims. Liebelt discloses an exterior flange 19 that appears to be at the opposite end of the alleged cap, but flange 19 is merely the same as flange 18 described in Liebelt, and thus flange 19 is not a recess portion as recited in the present claims. As such, Liebelt fails to teach or suggest each and every claim feature.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1, and dependent claims thereof, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the above rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,902,653 ("Miyahara") in view of Verhoest. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest an oiling roller assembly, including at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft, and wherein the at least one cap further includes a flange portion at an end of the cap that comes into contact with the oiling roller, and a recess portion at an opposite end of the cap, as recited in independent claim 1.

Miyahara merely discloses an oil holding cylinder attached by means of an annular fitting 3 to a driving shaft 2. See column 3, lines 49-51 (with reference to FIG. 1). Nowhere does Miyahara teach or suggest that at an end cap further includes a flange portion or a recess portion as recited in the present claims. In fact, the Office Action concedes that Miyahara

fails to disclose that end caps are on an end face of a roller shaft and relies on Verhoest for allegedly teaching this feature.

However, as mentioned above, Verhoest fails to cure the deficiencies of Miyhara in disclosing or rendering obvious the features of independent claim 1. As such, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1, and dependent claims thereof, are patentable over the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the above rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Rejoinder**

In response to a Restriction Requirement, claims 7-14 were withdrawn. However, in light of these withdrawn claims depending from or otherwise including all of the features of claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that upon allowance of claim 1, claims 7-14 should be rejoined and similarly allowed.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-3 and 5-14 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Kevin K. Jones  
Registration No. 56,809

JAO:KKJ/hs

Date: March 21, 2007

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--